Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this airworthiness directive, if any, may be obtained from the ECO.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) FAA-certificated air carriers that have an approved continuous airworthiness maintenance program in accordance with the record keeping requirement of § 121.369 (c) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.369 (c)] of this chapter must maintain records of the mandatory inspections that result from revising the Time Limits section of the Instructions for Continuous Airworthiness (ICA) and the air carrier's continuous airworthiness program. Alternately, certificated air carriers may establish an approved system of record retention that provides a method for preservation and retrieval of the maintenance records that include the inspections resulting from this AD, and include the policy and procedures for implementing this alternate method in the air carrier's maintenance manual required by § 121.369 (c) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.369 (c)]; however, the alternate system must be accepted by the appropriate PMI and require the maintenance records be maintained either indefinitely or until the work is repeated. Records of the piece-part inspections are not required under § 121.380 (a)(2)(vi) of the Federal Aviation Regulations [14 CFR 121.380 (a)(2)(vi)]. All other Operators must maintain the records of mandatory inspections required by the applicable regulations governing their operations.

Note 3: The requirements of this AD have been met when the engine manual changes are made and air carriers have modified their continuous airworthiness maintenance plans to reflect the requirements in the Engine Manuals.

Issued in Burlington, Massachusetts, on August 9, 1999.

David A. Downey,

Assistant Manager, Engine and Propeller Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–21178 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 914

[SPATS No. IN–143–FOR; State Program Amendment No. 98–5]

Indiana Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; public comment period and opportunity for public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is announcing receipt of a proposed amendment to the Indiana regulatory program (Indiana program) under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). Indiana proposes revisions to rules concerning revegetation standards for success for nonprime farmland for surface and underground coal mining and reclamation operations under IC 14–34. Indiana intends to revise its program to be consistent with the corresponding Federal regulations.

This document gives the times and locations that the Indiana program and amendment to that program are available for your inspection, the comment period during which you may submit written comments on the amendment, and the procedures that will be followed for the public hearing, if one is requested.

DATES: We will accept written comments until 4:00 p.m., e.s.t., September 15, 1999. If requested, we will hold a public hearing on the amendment on September 10, 1999. We will accept requests to speak at the hearing until 4:00 p.m., e.s.t. on August 31, 1999.

ADDRESSES: You should mail or hand deliver written comments and requests to speak at the hearing to Andrew R. Gilmore, Director, Indianapolis Field Office, at the address listed below.

You may review copies of the Indiana program, the amendment, a listing of any scheduled public hearings, and all written comments received in response to this document at the addresses listed below during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. You may receive one free copy of the amendment by contacting OSM's Indianapolis Field Office.

Andrew R. Gilmore, Director, Indianapolis Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Minton-Capehart Federal Building, 575 North Pennsylvania Street, Room 301, Indianapolis, IN 46204, Telephone: (317) 226–6700.

Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Mine Reclamation, 402 West Washington Street, Room W–295, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, Telephone: (317) 232–1291.

Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Reclamation, R.R. 2, Box 129, Jasonville, Indiana 47438–9517, Telephone: (812) 665–2207.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew R. Gilmore, Director, Indianapolis Field Office. Telephone: (317) 226–6700. Internet: INFOMAIL@indgw.osmre.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Indiana Program

On July 29, 1982, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Indiana program. You can find background information on the Indiana program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval in the July 26, 1982, **Federal Register** (47 FR 32107). You can find later actions on the Indiana program at 30 CFR 914.10, 914.15, and 914.16.

II. Description of the Proposed Amendment

By letter dated August 2, 1999 (Administrative Record No. IND–1664), Indiana sent us an amendment to its program under SMCRA. This amendment replaces State Program Amendment No. 95–2, which we approved in the May 30, 1995 **Federal Register** (60 FR 28069). Indiana sent the amendment at its own initiative. Indiana proposes to amend the Indiana Administrative Code (IAC). Below is a summary of the changes proposed by Indiana. The full text of the proposed program amendment is available for your inspection at the locations listed above under **ADDRESSES**.

310 IAC 12–5–64.1 (Surface) and 12–5–128.1 (Underground) Revegetation Standards for Success for Nonprime Farmland

Since the revisions being proposed for surface mining at § 12–5–64.1(c) are identical to those being proposed for underground mining at § 12–5–128.1(c), they will be combined for ease of discussion. These subsections provide the standards for success which are to be applied under the approved postmining land uses.

Indiana proposes paragraph notation changes to reflect the organizational changes made throughout subsections (c). Additionally, Indiana proposes revisions throughout subsections (c) to correct the reference to the ''Soil Conservation Service'' to the ''Natural Resources Conservation Service.''

Indiana proposes to revise subsection (c)(3)(B) by adding the requirement that if current Natural Resources Conservation Service predicted yield by soil map units are used to determine production of living plants, then the standard for success shall be a weighted

average of the predicted yields for each unmined soil type which existed on the permit areas at the time the permit was issued.

Indiana proposes to delete the existing language in subsection (c)(3)(C) for determining production of living plants on pastureland and replace it with the following:

(C) A target yield determined by the following formula: Target Yield = NRCS Target Yield × (CCA/10 Year CA) where: NRCS Target Yield = the average yield per acre, as predicted by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, for the crop and the soil map units being evaluated. The most current yield information at the time of permit issuance shall be used, and shall be contained in the appropriate sections of the permit application. CCA = the county average for the crop for the year being evaluated as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture crop reporting service, the Indiana Agricultural Statistics Service. 10 Year CA = the ten (10) Year Indiana Agricultural Statistics Service county average, consisting of the year being evaluated and the nine (9) preceding years.

Indiana proposes to add subsection (c)(3)(D) to allow other methods approved by the director of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to be used in determining success of production of living plants on revegetated nonprime farmland pasture land.

Indiana proposes to delete existing subsection (c)(4), and redesignate existing subsections (c)(5), (c)(6), (c)(7), and (c)(8) as subsections (c)(4), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (c)(7), respectively.

At new subsection (c)(5)(B), Indiana proposes to revise the existing language by adding the requirement that if current Natural Resources Conservation Service predicted yield by soil map units are used to determine production of living plants, then the standard for success shall be a weighted average of the predicted yields for each unmined soil type which existed on the permit areas at the time the permit was issued.

At new subsection (c)(5)(C), Indiana proposes to delete the existing language for determining production of living plants on cropland and replace it with the following:

(C) A target yield determined by the following formula: Target Yield = CCA x (NRCSP/NRCSC) where: CCA = the county average for the crop for the year being evaluated as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture crop reporting service, the Indiana Agricultural Statistics Service. NRCSP = the weighted average of the current Natural Resources Conservation Service predicted yield for each croppable, unmined soil which existed on the permit at the time the permit was issued. NRCSC = the weighted average of the current Natural Resources Conservation Service predicted yield for each croppable, unmined soil which is shown to exist in the county on the most current county soil survey. A croppable soil is any soil which the Natural Resources Conservation Service has defined as being in capability class I, II, III, or IV.

Indiana also proposes to add new subsections (c)(5)(D) and (c)(5)(E) to allow other methods approved by the director of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to be used in determining success of production of living plants on revegetated nonprime farmland pasture land. Once the method for establishing the standards has been selected, it may not be modified without the approval of the director of IDNR.

Finally, Indiana proposes to revise the language in new subsection (c)(6) by removing the requirement that if current Natural Resources Conservation Service predicted yield by soil map units are used to determine production of living plants, then the standard for success shall be a weighted average of the predicted yields for each unmined soil type which existed on the permit areas at the time the permit was issued.

III. Public Comment Procedures

Under the provisions of 30 CFR 732.17(h), we are requesting comments on whether the amendment satisfies the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. If we approve the amendment, it will become part of the Indiana program.

Written Comments

We will make comments, including names and addresses of respondents, available for public review during normal business hours. We will not consider anonymous comments. If individual respondents request confidentiality, we will honor their request to the extent allowable by law. Individual respondents who wish to withhold their name or address from public review, except for the city or town, must state this prominently at the beginning of their comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public review in their entirety.

Your written comments should be specific and pertain only to the issues proposed in this rulemaking. You should explain the reason for any recommended change. Please submit Internet comments as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Please also include ''Attn: SPATS No. IN–143–FOR,'' your name, and your return address in your Internet message. If you do not receive a confirmation that we have received your Internet message, contact the Indianapolis Field Office at (317) 226–6700. In the final rulemaking, we will not necessarily consider or include in the Administrative Record any comments received after the time indicated under ''DATES'' or at locations other than the Indianapolis Field Office.

Public Hearing

If you wish to speak at the public hearing, contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by 4:00 p.m., e.s.t. on August 31, 1999. We will arrange the location and time of the hearing with those persons requesting the hearing. If you are disabled and need special accommodations to attend a public hearing, contact the individual listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. The hearing will not be held if no one requests an opportunity to speak at the public hearing.

You should file a written statement at the time you request the hearing. This will allow us to prepare adequate responses and appropriate questions. The public hearing will continue on the specified date until all persons scheduled to speak have been heard. If you are in the audience and have not been scheduled to speak and wish to do so, you will be allowed to speak after those who have been scheduled. We will end the hearing after all persons scheduled to speak and persons present in the audience who wish to speak have been heard.

Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to speak at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. If you wish to meet with us to discuss the amendment, request a meeting by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**. All such meetings are open to the public and, if possible, we will post notices of meetings at the locations listed under **ADDRESSES**. We also make a written summary of each meeting a part of the Administrative Record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) exempts this rule from review under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review).

Executive Order 12988

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 3 of Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform) and has

determined that, to the extent allowed by law, this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on State regulatory programs and program amendments must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule does not require an environmental impact statement since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal which is the subject of this rule is based upon corresponding Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Therefore, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously published by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the corresponding Federal regulations.

Unfunded Mandates

OSM has determined and certifies under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (2 U.S.C. 1502 *et seq.*) that this rule will not impose a cost of $100 million or more in any given year on local, state, or tribal governments or private entities.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 914

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: August 6, 1999.

Charles Sandberg,

Acting Regional Director, Mid-Continent Regional Coordinating Center.

[FR Doc. 99–21138 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[MN48–01–7273b; FRL–6415–3]

Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Minnesota

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing to approve a December 31, 1998, request from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for new air pollution control requirements for the Minnesota sulfur dioxide (SO_2) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Marathon Ashland Petroleum LLC (Marathon). These requirements were submitted in the form of an Administrative Order (Order) and include revisions associated with the addition of a new stack, revised emission limits for numerous sources and other changes. The revisions result in an overall decrease in allowable SO_2 emissions from the facility. The new requirements have been evaluated through a computerized modeling analysis and have shown that they will attain and maintain the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for SO_2.

In the final rules section of the **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this action as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no relevant adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no relevant adverse comments are received in response to this rule, no further activity is contemplated, and the direct final rule will become effective. If EPA receives relevant adverse comments, the direct final rule with be withdrawn, and all public comments received during the 30-day comment period set forth below will be addressd in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: We must receive comments by September 15, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: Carlton T. Nash, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch, (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randall Robinson, Meteorologist, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604, (312) 353–6713.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the above address. (Please telephone Randall Robinson before visiting the Region 5 Office.)

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Incorporation by reference, Sulfur dioxide.

Dated: July 22, 1999.

Jerri-Anne Garl,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region 5.

[FR Doc. 99–21013 Filed 8–13–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[R1–052–7211b; A–1–FRL–6417–4]

Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Approval of National Low Emission Vehicle Program

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is proposing to approve a State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the State of Connecticut on February 7, 1996 and February 18, 1999, providing that the national low emission vehicle (National LEV) is an acceptable compliance option for new motor vehicles sold in the State, which had previously adopted the California low emission vehicle (CAL LEV) program. Auto